Filālī ruling house (*ca.* 1050/1640); and the ruinous site of Sidjilmāsa, whose *ḳaṣba* was finally destroyed by the Ayt Atta in 1818.

Bibliography: See those to ʿALAWĪS and SIDJILMĀSA, and also P. Ricard, revised Ch. Bacquet, *Guide Bleue. Maroc*, 8th ed. Paris 1954, 424-31 and map at p. 416. (E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL*)

TAFḴĪM (A.), the verbal noun from *faḫḫama* meaning "to make thick, to emphasise or to make grand". In Arabic, it is a phonetic phenomenon involving the pronunciation of the emphatic consonants, *mufaḫḫama* (sing. *mufaḫḫam*), /ṭ ط, ḍ ض, ṣ ص, ẓ ظ/and also includes the marginal emphatics /ṛ, ḷ/. Ḳurʾānic orthoepists used the term *tafḫīm* to describe certain variants of /r/ when it occurs next to low and back vowels; however, they designated the term *taghlīẓ*, thickening, which they used synonymously with *tafḫīm*, for the description of certain variants of /l/. The /ḷ/, as an emphatic variant, has a limited environment and is primarily used with the word *Allāh* when not preceded by /i, ī/.

The earliest occurrence of the term *tafḫīm* was when Sībawayhi used it to describe what he called *alif al-tafḫīm* and he considered it as a variant, not a phoneme. According to him, *alif al-tafḫīm* is found in a limited number of words such as *ṣalāt*, prayers; *zakāt*, the giving of alms to the poor; and *ḥayāt*, life, especially in the dialect of Ḥidjāz (*al-Kitāb*, iv, 432). The four primary emphatic consonants /ṣ, ḍ, ṭ ẓ / are not referred to by Sībawayhi as *mufaḫḫama* but as *muṭbaḳa* (sing. *muṭbaḳ*), a tradition followed by Arab grammarians and Ḳurʾānic orthoepists. The verbal noun *iṭbāḳ* "act of covering or putting on a lid", is used to describe the position of the tongue in the pronunciation of the *muṭbaḳa*. The *muṭbaḳa*, along with the velar/uvular group /x خ, ɣ غ, q ق/, are referred to by the generic term *mustaʿliya*, high or raised. The *mustaʿliya* consonants are described as preventing the occurrence of *imāla* [*q.v.*], "inclination" of /a/ towards /i/.

Contemporary Arabists and linguists use the term *tafḫīm* to describe the emphatic consonants, *mufaḫḫama*, /ṭ, ḍ, ṣ, ẓ / and the marginal emphatics /ṛ and ḷ/. *Tafḫīm* is often characterised by pharyngealisation or velarisation, but the *mufaḫḫama* consonants are best characterised by the phonetic feature of retraction which involves moving the tongue up and further back toward the velum and upper pharynx. *Tafḫīm* is not restricted to the environment of the emphatics, but rather spreads to any adjacent vowel or consonant making it emphatic. It is this feature of retraction that makes this group of consonants opaque [see ṢAWTIYYA].

Bibliography: For related articles on *tafḫīm* in *EI*², see IMĀLA, MAḴĀRIDJ AL-ḤURŪF and ṢAWTIYYA. Also Salman H. Al-Ani, and Mohamed S. El-Dalee, *Tafḫīm in Arabic. The acoustic and physiological parameter*, in M.P.R. Van den Broecke and A. Cohen (eds.), *Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, Utrecht 1984, 385-9; Ibn Djinnī, *Sirr ṣināʿat al-iʿrāb*, Damascus 1985, i, 45-67; Ibn al-Djazarī, *al-Nashr fī ʾl-ḳirāʾāt al-ʿashr*, Cairo n.d., i, 210-4, ii, 90-119. R. Jakobson, *Mufaxxama. The "emphatic" phonemes in Arabic*, in *Studies presented to Joshua Whatmough*, ed. E. Pulgram, The Hague 1957, 105-15; Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Beirut 1975, iv.

(SALMAN H. AL-ANI)

ṬAFRA (A.), lit., "leap or impulsive movement", from *ṭafara* "to jump, leap", a term of Islamic philosophy, which became an important part of anti-atomistic theories brought into play during the controversies of the Baṣra Muʿtazilī cosmology, and which is attributed in particular to Ibrāhīm b. Sayyār al-Naẓẓām (and also to Hishām b. al-Ḥakam). Al-Naẓẓām [*q.v.*] is taken to have argued that it is possible to move over a distance without going through all the parts of the distance, by leaping over those parts. Although this theory came in for a lot of criticism by those sympathetic to atomism, al-Naẓẓām was successful in pointing to difficulties in the minimal parts discrete geometry of the atomists. This is a version of the paradoxes which Zeno first discussed in connection with the existence of indivisible magnitudes. The paradox of the flying arrow is that every thing which is moving is really resting at each stage of the movement. The movement itself is hidden in the substance and only appears when the substance itself is moving. Hishām al-Fuwaṭī (*fl.* early 3rd/9th century) is said to have abandoned the theory of leaps once he realised that, if it is valid, then a creature which had dipped its legs in ink would produce a discontinuous rather than a continuous track when it covered a particular distance (see Ibn Mattawayh, 169). This sort of example played a large part in contemporary disputes over the plausibility of atomism and its alternatives as a theory of the nature of physical reality.

Bibliography: Ashʿarī, *Makālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, Istanbul 1929-30, 61, 321; Baghdādī, *Farḳ*, 113; Shahrastānī, 38-39; Ibn Ḥazm, *Fiṣal*, Cairo 1899, 64, 92; Isfarāʾinī, *Tabṣīr*, Cairo 1955, 68; H. Daiber, *Das theologisch-philosophische System des Muʿammar ibn ʿAbbād as-Sulamī*, Beirut 1975, 300-2; Ibn Mattawayh, *Tadhkira fī aḥkām al-djawāhir wa ʾl-aʿrāḍ*, ed. S. Luṭf and F. ʿAwn, Cairo 1975; H. Wolfson, *The philosophy of the Kalam*, Cambridge, Mass. 1976, 514-7; J. van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra*, Berlin and New York 1991-7, iii, 310-24, and index s.v. *ṭ-f-r* at iv, 1001; A. Dhanani, *The physical theory of kalām. Atoms, space and void in Basrian Muʿtazilī cosmology*, Leiden 1994, 176-81. (O.N.H. LEAMAN)

TAFSĪR (A.), pl. *tafāsīr* "interpretation" (as a process and a literary genre), generally, but not always, of the Ḳurʾān. The word is used for commentaries on Greek scientific and philosophical works, being equivalent to *sharḥ* [*q.v.*]; the term is applied to the Greek and Arabic commentaries on the works of Aristotle, for example. Jews and Christians writing in Arabic also use the word in the context of translations and commentaries on the Bible, as some of the works of Saadia Gaon demonstrate. The most significant usage of the word, however, and the focus of this article, is its reference to the branch of Islamic learning concerned with the Ḳurʾān. An essential part of *madrasa* training, the study of *tafāsīr* of the Ḳurʾān stands alongside the study of *ḥadīth* and *fiḳh* as elements of the traditional curriculum.

The emergence of the word *tafsīr* as a technical term is unclear. It is used once in the Ḳurʾān at XXV, 33, "They [the unbelievers] bring not to thee [Muḥammad] any similitude [*mathal*] but that We bring thee the truth and the best *tafsīr*". This follows on a verse which states, "The unbelievers say, 'Why has the Ḳurʾān not been sent down all at once?' Even so, that We may strengthen thy heart thereby, and We have chanted it very distinctly". The idea would appear to be that God has provided an explanation, *tafsīr*, of why the Ḳurʾān is being revealed piece-by-piece. Of course, other technical terms in Muslim religious thinking frequently have no special status within the Ḳurʾān, so the lack of a firm reference point for the

term *tafsīr* is not particularly surprising (see J. Wansbrough, *Quranic studies. Sources and methods of scriptural interpretation*, Oxford 1977, 154-8). For the first three Islamic centuries, there appears to be no consistent differentiation between *tafsīr*, *ta'wīl* [*q.v.*] and *maʿnā* [*q.v.*, section 1] when used in titles of books or as a technical term within works of *tafsīr* (and, indeed, this is the attitude of the lexicographers: see Lane, i, 2397; for the ambiguities of the differentiation between the terms in early times, see N. Kinberg, *A lexicon of al-Farrāʾ's terminology in his Qurʾān commentary*, Leiden 1996, 40-2, 503-27, 563-6). After some time, *tafsīr* was distinguished from *ta'wīl* by the latter being considered the product of research and investigation, the former dependent upon transmission from Muḥammad and his companions. In its developed sense, *ta'wīl* became limited to interpretation which leaves the "obvious" (*ẓāhir*) sense and delves into more speculative levels of language (*bāṭin*). *Maʿnā*, on the other hand, became more constrained and limited primarily to lexicographical aspects of interpretation.

A *tafsīr* of the Ḳur'ān is a work which provides an interpretation of the Arabic text of the scripture. There are formal characteristics of such works which help to define the literary genre further. In most cases, a work entitled *Tafsīr* will follow the text of the Ḳur'ān from the beginning to the end, and will provide an interpretation (*tafsīr*) of segments of the text (word-by-word, phrase-by-phrase, or verse-by-verse) as a running commentary. The major exceptions to this fundamental characteristic are to be found in the formative and the contemporary periods of Islam; in the formative period, one finds works of *tafsīr* which cover only isolated segments of the text, and in the contemporary period, thematic (*mawḍūʿī*) *tafāsīr* have become quite popular (see J.J.G. Jansen, *The interpretation of the Koran in modern Egypt*, Leiden 1974, 13-4). But the presence of scriptural text and commentary as two elements interplaying remains. A number of sub-disciplines are often included within the broad scholarly enterprise itself and these have resulted in books which concentrate on *asbāb al-nuzūl*, *gharīb al-Ḳur'ān*, *ḳiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, *ḳirāʾāt*, *marsūm al-ḵhaṭṭ*, *al-nāsiḵh wa 'l-mansūḵh*, *al-waḳf wa 'l-ibtidāʾ* and *al-wuḏjūh wa 'l-naẓāʾir*. These works are best understood as a part of the overall *ʿulūm al-Ḳur'ān* (to which books are devoted as summaries of the various sub-disciplines, e.g., al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392 [*q.v.*]), *al-Burhān fī ʿulūm al-Ḳur'ān*, and Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505 [*q.v.*]), *al-Itḳān fī ʿulūm al-Ḳur'ān*). However, the contents of these books have often been derived from the major works of *tafsīr* (and then subsequently have acted as a source for them in many instances), so, in that sense, such works are a part of the intellectual discipline while not formally being a part of the literary genre.

Within the genre attempts have been made to classify the various books. Attempts to describe the "method" of the books predominate in Muslim discussions, and such classifications have also found their way into scholarly works (e.g., I. Goldziher, *Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung*, Leiden 1920). The basic separation between *tafsīr bi 'l-maʾṯūr* (or *riwāya*) and *tafsīr bi 'l-raʾy* (or *dirāya*), with the occasional addition of *tafsīr bi 'l-ishāra*, reflects a tension which runs throughout the Muslim community and its intellectual disciplines, that of the authority of the community (*maʾṯūr*) versus that of the intellect (*raʾy*) (*ishāra* being the speculative "hint" or "allusion" generally connected to Ṣūfism and outside these two main classifications). This separation does not, however, provide a sufficient analytical tool by which one may characterise the wide variety of books and approaches which are contained within the broadly-defined genre of *tafsīr*, since it concentrates on a superficial understanding of the form of the works with little attention to their underlying substance.

Recent scholarly attempts to define the genre have concentrated on isolating the variety of elements which come together within a given text in varying proportions (see N. Calder, *Tafsīr from Ṭabarī to Ibn Kathīr: problems in the description of a genre, illustrated with reference to the story of Abraham*, in G.R. Hawting and A.-K.A. Shareef (eds.), *Approaches to the Qurʾān*, London 1993, 101-40; P. Heath, *Creative hermeneutics: a comparative analysis of three Islamic approaches*, in *Arabica*, xxxvi [1989], 173-210). Different *mufassirūn* have different concerns and goals, and this is reflected in the relative weight they put upon elements such as history, grammar, semantics, law, theology, or folklore. All commentators are concerned with the process of analysing the text in light of the "external world", however that be defined for the individual author, with the aim of resolving any apparent conflict and making the text "clear". Each element that comes into play within a text of *tafsīr* acts both to prompt exegesis (in the sense that a conflict is perceived between the world and the text) and to characterise the emphasis of a given interpretative approach.

Pride of place in the tools used in the interpretative process has been given to grammar (including elements of lexicography and orthography). As an implement for asserting the scholar's status and authority, arguments over grammar have had no rival (see M.G. Carter, *Language control as people control in medieval Islam: the aims of the grammarians in their cultural context*, in *Al-Abḥāṯ*, xxxi [1983], 65-84). Grammar became a specialisation within *tafsīr*, producing works such as *Maʿānī 'l-Ḳur'ān wa iʿrābuhu* by al-Zadjdjādj (d. 311/923; see *GAS*, viii, 99-101), *Iʿrāb al-Ḳur'ān* by al-Naḥḥās (d. 338/950; see *GAS*, ix, 207-9) and *Mushkil iʿrāb al-Ḳur'ān* by Makkī al-Ḳaysī (d. 437/1045 [*q.v.*]). The historical origins of grammar and lexicographical comparison within the framework of *tafsīr* have become a matter of scholarly controversy in light of Wansbrough's arguments for the relatively late introduction of both aspects (see *Quranic studies*, 216-27); for example, C.H.M. Versteegh, *Arabic grammar and Qurʾānic exegesis in early Islam*, Leiden 1993, and M. Muranyi, *Neue Materialien zur tafsīr-Forschung in der Moscheebibliothek von Qairawān*, in S. Wild (ed.), *The Qurʾan as text*, Leiden 1996, 225-55, both argue against Wansbrough's point, citing grammar and poetical references in texts understood to be early in date. Much of the dispute depends upon dating of texts (see A. Rippin, *Studying early tafsīr texts*, in *Isl.*, lxxii [1995], 310-23).

Rivalling grammar but yet itself often thought of as dependent upon it, the framework of legal analysis emerges quite clearly in some works, achieving a status reflected in titles such as the *Aḥkām al-Ḳur'ān* written by the Ḥanafī al-Djaṣṣāṣ (d. 370/981 [*q.v.*]), the Mālikī Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 543/1148 [*q.v.*]) and the Mālikī al-Ḳurṭubī (d. 671/1272 [*q.v.*]). Aiming to demonstrate that the body of Islamic law may be derived in the first instance from the Ḳur'ān, such works include, out of necessity, grammatical and historical elements within interpretation in order to argue their legal points.

Theology, on the other hand, frequently remained subsumed within the overall contents of *tafsīr*, although certain works attributed to prominent theologians (e.g. the *Ḥaḳāʾiḳ al-taʾwīl fī mutashābih al-tanzīl* by al-Sharīf

al-Raḍī, d. 406/1016 [*q.v.*]) tend to provide a thorough-going emphasis on a certain theological perspective. The famous work of al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144 [*q.v.*]), renowned for its Muʿtazilī perspective, is distinctive primarily for its special outlook and not for the presence of an overall theological argument *per se*, nor for the quantity of such argumentation. Other works, especially those from Shīʿī writers such as al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067) and al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153), provide more detailed and thorough-going examples of the Muʿtazilī tendency, as does the work only available in "reconstructed" form from al-Djubbāʾī (d. 303/915 [*q.v.*]) (see D. Gimaret, *Une lecture muʿtazilite du Coran. Le* tafsīr *d'Abū ʿAlī al-Djubbāʾī* [*m. 303/915*], Louvain-Paris 1994). All other major works of *tafsīr* have a theological perspective as well (see e.g. C. Gilliot, *Exégèse, langue, et théologie en Islam. L'exégèse coranique de Ṭabari* (*m. 311/923*), Paris 1990, 207-78) but are not so "distinctive" as to gain a reputation in that regard. The observation regarding al-Zamakhsharī's distinctiveness (but not uniqueness) is confirmed by the frequent use of that book within the *madrasa* context, regardless of its theological perspective.

The genius of Muslim *tafsīr* is perhaps best seen in its historicisation of the text through the general tools of narrative provided by prophetic history, both of the distant past as found in the *kiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, and of the contemporary as found in the *sīra* of Muḥammad. Designed both to prove the fact of revelation and to embody an interpretation that would relate the text to a context (see Rippin, *The function of asbāb al-nuzūl in Qurʾānic exegesis*, in *BSOAS*, li [1988], 1-20), historicisation grounded the text in the day-to-day life of the Muslim community. In that manner, the extraction of law was facilitated, the sense of moral guidance was emphasised and the "foreign" made Islamic. Whether this was a matter of filling in the details on the life of the former prophets with incidents to which Muslims could relate (see e.g. J. Lassner, *Demonizing the Queen of Sheba. Boundaries of gender and culture in post-biblical Judaism and medieval Islam*, Chicago 1993), a concern with identifying the unknown within the context of the life of Muḥammad (*taʿyīn al-mubham*) (see U. Rubin, *The eye of the beholder: the life of Muḥammad as viewed by the early Muslims: a textual analysis*, Princeton 1995), or a polemical impulse from the context of Sunnī-Shīʿī interaction (see e.g. U. Rubin, *Prophets and progenitors in the early Shīʿa tradition*, in *JSAI*, i [1979], 41-65), historicisation of the text was comprehensive and compelling. Of course, this is not the history of contemporary historians, but a history which is both controlled by, and productive of, the meaning of the text of the Ḳurʾān.

It is in the flight from the constraints of sacred history, however, that symbol, allegory and inspiration gained their status, especially in *tafsīr* from within the context of Ṣūfism, but by no means limited to that area. The appreciation of the literary qualities of the text of the Ḳurʾān in terms of literary figures and general stylistic concerns may well have led, over the course of time, to more wide-ranging symbolic and allegorical readings of the text. In the hands of Ṣūfīs, such readings became supported by notions of insight derived from mystical experience; this is reflected in the text of their *tafāsīr* in the way in which a passage of the Ḳurʾān can be the jumping-off point (a "keynote") for a meditation on a topic seemingly unconnected to the text itself but derived from images contained within the personal experience of the individual Ṣūfī (on Ṣūfī interpretation, see P. Nwyia, *Exégèse coranique et langue mystique*, Beirut 1970).

Within all these aspects and procedures, there are changing emphases over time. Variability in the matter of citation of authorities is one such factor, and the one which Muslims seized upon in their efforts at classification, as noted above. Expansion and contraction in the number of meanings provided is another, independent variable which appears to vary over time. It is perhaps one of the ironies (but also one of an author's celebrations) that the reliance on the citation of authorities tended, in some hands at least, to proliferate meanings. There was a continual building upon the past which was being accumulated for future generations within these works. Al-Ḳurṭubī, for example, exemplifies the tendency towards multiplicity of meanings with little indication of what is to be preferred. The Ḳurʾān, it is being suggested, incorporates all these potentialities. Named authorities are an important element within this proliferation of alternatives. But even then, it needs to be remembered that all this is done within a certain framework of the author, his concerns and allegiances (e.g. his concept of what "Sunnī" Islam encompasses). The citations are always subject to choice, the authorities subject to selection. Time, location, sectarian and popular beliefs will all have affected the selections and choices. The selection of material is precisely what defines the tradition within which an author is working (and thus for the purposes of this overview of *tafsīr* as a genre, distinctions such as Sunnī versus Shīʿī are irrelevant; on the specific characteristics of the latter, see G. Monnot, *Islam: exégèse coranique*, in *Annuaire EPHE, V^e section*, xci [1982-3], 309-17).

Another such variable may be seen in the expansion and contraction in the amount of supplementary material provided within a *tafsīr*. This is especially so in the contemporary context, but it is a tendency which has roots in the mature stage of Muslim *tafsīr* for a variety of reasons. Some authors clearly aimed their works at more popular (although not necessarily less learned) audiences with the result of producing concise works suitable for easy copying and detailed study. Such works (e.g. Djalāl al-Dīn al-Maḥallī, d. 864/1459 [*q.v.*] and Djalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī [d. 911/1505], *Tafsīr al-Djalālayn*) end up being technical and presumptive of a great deal of knowledge in areas of grammar and the like. Other authors, however, reacted to the accumulation of exegetical material with a more negative attitude, feeling that much of it was "getting away" from the meaning of the Ḳurʾān. Categories of material emerged which were deemed to be extraneous and were to be censured: the movement against *Isrāʾīliyyāt* [*q.v.*], a technical term within *tafsīr* apparently first employed as such by Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328 [*q.v.*]), serves as the prime example of this tendency. Rigorous *isnād* criticism and a prioritising of knowledge by its proximity in time to Muḥammad also provided criteria by which the treasure trove of material from the generations of past exegetes was whittled down to produce more limited ranges of meaning.

In tracing the historical developments of the genre, it is possible to separate out four periods of expression: formative, classical, mature and contemporary. The separation is artificial, particularly fuzzy at the edges and certainly in need of refinement. It does, however, provide a means by which to summarise the contents of the genre by its highlights.

A debate has raged for a century now in scholarly literature concerning the origins of *tafsīr* as a procedure and as written works. To some extent, this is a continuation of a debate within Islam itself concern-

ing authority in *tafsīr*: did Muḥammad authorise interpreting the Ḳur'ān? If so, then interpretations from him and his closest companions might be thought to be of the highest importance in establishing what the text means. It may be observed in passing that such an argument tends to be a restraining one, suggesting a limited range of legitimate meanings; these arguments become closely associated in mediaeval times with Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373 [*q.v.*]). On the other hand, an early reluctance to interpret the Ḳur'ān is to be noted, especially associated with statements attributed to the caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb [*q.v.*]. An attempt to reconcile these two ideas is found in the notion that 'Umar was only against interpretation of "unclear" verses. The lack of documentary evidence makes the debate a difficult one to adjudicate, and the debate among the views of Goldziher, *Richtungen*; H. Birkeland, *Old Muslim opposition against the interpretation of the Koran*, Oslo 1955; N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic literary papyri: Qur'ānic commentary and tradition*, Chicago 1967; and Wansbrough, *Quranic studies*, remains unresolved (see Gilliot, *Les débuts de l'exégèse coranique*, in *RMMM*, lviii. 4 [1990], 82-100).

One response to this uncertain historical situation has been the attempt on the part of a number of contemporary editors to reconstruct texts on the basis of attributions found in later texts. Such "books" are historically said to have existed (as Sezgin documents in *GAS*, i, 6-8, 25-35 esp.) but are no longer found in manuscript copies. Thus the only choice has been to reconstruct them. Such publications have recently proliferated and a number of examples can be cited: al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728 [*q.v.*] and see Gilliot, *Textes arabes anciens édités en Egypte au cours des années 1992 à 1994*, in *MIDEO*, xxii [1994], 295-6, no. 36); Ibn Abī Ṭalḥa (d. 120/737; see Gilliot, *Textes arabes anciens édités en Egypte au cours des années 1990 à 1992*, in *MIDEO*, xxi [1993], 439-40, no. 78); al-Suddī (d. 128/745; see Gilliot, *Textes arabes anciens édités en Egypte au cours des années 1992 à 1994*, 296, no. 37, and E. Kohlberg, *A medieval Muslim scholar at work. Ibn Ṭāwūs and his library*, Leiden 1992, 348, no. 574); and Sufyān b. 'Uyayna (d. 196/811 [*q.v.*], and see Gilliot, *Les débuts de l'exégèse coranique*, 89-90). In some senses, these reconstructions may be no different from the supposedly early works found in late manuscript form ascribed to Mudjāhid b. Djabr (d. *ca.* 100-4/718-22 [*q.v.*], and see Gilliot, *Textes arabes anciens édités en Egypte au cours des années 1990 à 1992*, 440, no. 79) and Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778 [*q.v.*], and see Gilliot, *Les débuts de l'exégèse coranique*, 89). A fundamental issue exists regarding the fragmentary nature of these books: should it be interpreted as evidence of the fragmentary nature of early *tafsīr per se*, or as evidence of a mediaeval attempt to extract these books from later works? On this, see Rippin, *Al-Zuhrī, naskh al-Qur'ān and the problem of early tafsīr texts*, in *BSOAS*, xlvii (1985), 22-43.

We are on somewhat firmer ground for discussion of the formative period of *tafsīr* with a series of books the character of which is more cohesive and thus more likely to be authentic, although certainly not free of later interpolation, reformulation and editorial intrusion. Works ascribed to Muḳātil b. Sulaymān (d. 150/767 [*q.v.*]), al-Farrā' (d. 207/822 [*q.v.*]), 'Abd al-Razzāḳ al-San'ānī (d. 211/827; see *GAS*, i, 99), and al-Akhfash al-Awsaṭ (d. 215/830; see Gilliot, *Textes arabes anciens édités en Egypte au cours des années 1990 à 1992*, 441-2, no. 81) may all be thought to fit into this category. However, the work ascribed to al-Kalbī (d. 146/763 [*q.v.*])—and at the same time ascribed to 'Abd Allāh b. al-'Abbās (d. *ca.* 68/687 [*q.v.*]) and al-Fīrūzābādī (d. 817/1415 [*q.v.*])—indicates the difficulty in accepting an ascription without detailed examination and comparison; in this particular case, the work is more likely attributed to the 4th/10th century (see Rippin, *Tafsīr Ibn 'Abbās and criteria for dating early tafsīr texts*, in *JSAI*, xviii [1994], 38-83). It should be noted that the fragmentary nature of the works ascribed to Ibn Wahb (d. 197/812 [*q.v.*]) has been argued by Muranyi, *'Abd Allāh b. Wahb (125/743-197/812). al-Ǧāmi'. Tafsīr al-Qur'ān (Die Koranexegese)*, Wiesbaden 1993-5, i, 2, to be evidence that this formative stage of *tafsīr* is not as uniform as the above summary may suggest, but the nagging question of assessing the date of all these early texts still remains.

The classical period of *tafsīr* is often considered to come into existence with the *Ǧāmi' al-bayān 'an ta'wīl āy al-Ḳur'ān* of Abū Djaʿfar al-Ṭabarī (d. 311/923 [*q.v.*]). Al-Ṭabarī's work, the focus of a series of studies by Gilliot (esp. *Exégèse, langue et théologie en Islam*), is a vast compendium of traditions and analysis in which grammar plays its role as the major arbitrator between rival meanings. However, this period was clearly one of intense development of works of *tafsīr*, and several significant works from authors who lived roughly in the same period as al-Ṭabarī still exist and need to be viewed as a part of this expression of classical *tafsīr*. Notably, a number of other works that express differing theological viewpoints need close attention, especially when viewed in light of the polemical aspects of al-Ṭabarī: Hūd b. Muḥkim (d. towards the end of the 3rd/9th century; see *GAS*, i, 41), *Tafsīr*, an Ibāḍī work; Furāt b. Furāt al-Kūfī (d. *ca.* 310/922; see *GAS*, i, 539), *Tafsīr*, Shī'ī; al-'Ayyāshī (d. *ca.* 320/932 [*q.v.*]), *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*, Shī'ī; al-Ḳummī (d. end 4th/10th century; see *GAS*, i 45-6), *Tafsīr al-Ḳur'ān*, a brief and markedly Shī'ī work; al-Tustarī (d. 283/896; see *GAS*, i, 647, and G. Böwering, *The mystical vision of existence in classical Islam. The Qur'ānic hermeneutics of the Ṣūfī Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896)*, Berlin 1980), *Tafsīr*. More subtle in its theological variance but significant none the less is al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944 [*q.v.*]), *Ta'wīlāt ahl al-sunna* (only vol. i published).

Within the mature phase of *tafsīr* there is an abundant number of works, the full dimensions of which have not been fully catalogued. Among the most famous are al-Thaʿlabī (d. 427/1035 [*q.v.*]), *al-Kashf wa 'l-bayān 'an tafsīr al-Ḳur'ān* (unpublished except for its bibliographic introduction, ed. I. Goldfeld, Acre 1984), a vast compendium of material whose interests are partially reflected in the author's work, *'Arā'is al-madjālis fī ḳiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'*; al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021; see *GAS*, i, 671-4, and G. Böwering, *The Qur'ān commentary of al-Sulamī*, in W.B. Hallaq and D.P. Little (eds.), *Islamic studies presented to Charles J. Adams*, Leiden 1991, 41-56), *Ḥaḳā'iḳ al-tafsīr*, a work characterised by Ṣūfī interpretations (al-Sulamī's *Ziyādāt ḥaḳā'iḳ al-tafsīr* has now been published, ed. Böwering, Beirut 1995); al-Māwardī (d. 450/1058 [*q.v.*], and see Gilliot, *Textes arabes anciens édités en Egypte au cours des années 1992 à 1994*, 296-7, no. 38), *al-Nukat wa 'l-'uyūn*; al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067 [*q.v.*]), *al-Tibyan fī tafsīr al-Ḳur'ān*, a significant Shī'ī expression; al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf 'an ḥaḳā'iḳ ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl*; al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153 [*q.v.*], and also see M.O.A. Abdul, *The Qur'an: Shaykh Tabarsi's commentary*, Lahore 1977), *Madjmaʿ al-bayān li-'ulūm al-Ḳur'ān*, a moderate Shī'ī work; Ibn al-Djawzī (d. 597/1201 [*q.v.*], and see Jane McAuliffe, *Ibn al-Ǧawzī's exegetical propaedeutic: introduction and translation*, in *Alif. Journal of Comparative Poetics*, viii [1988], 101-13), Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209

[*q.v.*], *Kitāb zād al-masīr fī 'ilm al-tafsīr*, and also see the studies by J. Jomier, *Les mafatih al-ghayb de l'imam Fakhr al-Din al-Razi: quelques dates, lieux, manuscrits*, in *MIDEO*, xiii [1977], 253-90 and *Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (m. 606 H./1210) et les commentaires du Coran plus anciens*, in *ibid.*, xv [1982], 145-72), *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, a work generally cited for its vast coverage and philosophical depth; al-Ḳurṭubī (d. 671/1273 [*q.v.*]), *al-Djāmi' li-aḥkām al-Ḳur'ān*, one of the most masterly compendia of interpretational material; al-Bayḍāwī (d. between 685-716/1286-1316; [*q.v.*]), *Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-ta'wīl*, a work usually understood as an epitomisation of that of al-Zamakhsharī, minus the Mu'tazilī theological slant; 'Abd al-Razzāḳ al-Kāshānī (d. 731/1330 [*q.v.*], see also P. Lory, *Les commentaires ésotériques du Coran d'après 'Abd ar-Razzāq al-Qāshānī*, Paris 1980), usually known under the title *Tafsīr Ibn al-'Arabī*, a Ṣūfī *tafsīr*, reflecting al-Kāshānī's mystical forebear Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 628/1240 [*q.v.*]); Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnāṭī (d. 745/1344 [*q.v.*]), *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ*; Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr al-Ḳur'ān al-'aẓīm*; al-Maḥallī and al-Suyūṭī, *Tafsīr al-Djalālayn*; al-Suyūṭī also wrote his own larger work, *al-Durr al-manthūr fi 'l-tafsīr bi 'l-ma'thūr*. This summary of titles only takes into account some of the major published works readily available; many more works exist, both published and unpublished, especially from the later centuries, of which only a small portion has been examined with scholarly eyes.

It is in this mature phase that substantial debates rage within the discipline and have their affect upon the works produced. Ibn Taymiyya's *al-Muḳaddima fī uṣūl al-tafsīr* is one of the most strident and polemical of all such presentations and the effect of these ideas on Ibn Kathīr and many contemporary *mufassirūn* is noticeable. Fundamentally antagonistic to intellectual speculation of all types, whether legal or exegetical, Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Kathīr stand in contrast to the general tendency in *tafsīr* to allow for diversity. The latter champions dogmatism in his attempt to juxtapose and reconcile the Ḳur'ān and the *sunna*, both understood as revealed books (see Calder, *Tafsīr from Ṭabarī to Ibn Kathīr*, 130; McAuliffe, *Quranic hermeneutics: the views of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Kathīr*, in Rippin, *Approaches to the history of the interpretation of the Qur'ān*, Oxford 1988, 46-62).

In a manner which may well be unique amongst the world's religions, Muslims continue down to the present day to produce *tafāsīr* of the classical form, while also taking the enterprise into new literary regions. The contemporary phase of *tafsīr*, then, is an important one. The impetus behind much of the writing of *tafāsīr* from the 19th century on has been an attempt to simplify the content of the texts, making them more accessible to an increasingly literate but not necessarily formally religiously-trained population. As well, there has been the desire to spread religious and social ideas associated with the various contemporary platforms of reform, and an effective vehicle for doing this has been *tafsīr* (overviews of the subject are provided by J.M.S. Baljon, *Modern Muslim Koran interpretation (1880-1960)*, Leiden 1968, and J.J.G. Jansen, *The interpretation of the Koran in modern Egypt*).

One can, then, point to a series of *tafāsīr* written in the 19th and 20th centuries that, in basic form, follow the classical literary genre. It is in their authors' conceptions of the world around them that the texts differ so markedly from their classical counterparts. This has especially led to a displacement of the exegetical tools of grammar and to an emphasis on theology and law but with those two disciplines defined to a large extent outside of their classical modes. Thus the *Tafsīr al-Manār* of Muḥammad 'Abduh (d. 1905 [*q.v.*]) and Rashīd Riḍā (d. 1935 [*q.v.*]) places an emphasis on law but sees this in general terms of moral guidance on the practical and social planes. Perhaps the most famous and influential of all contemporary *tafāsīr*, *Fī ẓilāl al-Ḳur'ān* of Sayyid Ḳuṭb (d. 1966 [*q.v.*]), is an eloquent statement constructing an Islamic vision of the world that is, at times, brilliant in its ability to relate the Ḳur'ānic text to the contemporary situation often through the tools of allegory and symbolism (see e.g. A.H. Johns, *Let my people go! Sayyid Quṭb and the vocation of Moses*, in *Islam and Christian-Muslim relations*, i [1990], 143-70, and O. Carré, *Mystique et politique. Lecture revolutionnaire du Coran par Sayyid Quṭb, frère musulman radical*, Paris 1984). Likewise, works known as *tafsīr 'ilmī* (for example, Ṭanṭāwī Djawharī (d. 1940 [see DJAWHARĪ, ṬANṬĀWĪ]), *al-Djawāhir fī tafsīr al-Ḳur'ān al-karīm*) are characterised by an emphasis upon the "scientific" elements of the Ḳur'ān and could be said to introduce a new tool for interpretation, that of the discipline of science.

As well, there has been a tendency among contemporary writers to leave the form of classical *tafsīr* and compose works more limited in scope but embracing particular methods of approach. 'Ā'isha 'Abd al-Raḥmān (b. 1913) has written (under the pseudonym Bint al-Shāṭi') *al-Tafsīr al-bayānī li 'l-Ḳur'ān al-Karīm*, a study of 14 short *sūras* which focusses on lexical matters and "original meanings" of individual words within a framework of attention to Ḳur'ānic stylistic usage. Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, *Mafhūm al-naṣṣ. Dirāsa fī 'ulūm al-Ḳur'ān*, is another recent example in quite a different vein, for it is a book which raises methodological issues (severely challenged by some) about the understanding of the Ḳur'ān within contemporary times, in a form structured along the lines of classical introductions to *tafsīr* (see R. Wielandt, *Wurzeln der Schwierigkeit innerislamischen Gesprächs über neue hermeneutische Zugänge zum Korantext*, in Wild (ed.), *The Qur'an as text*, 257-82).

The other important approach in contemporary times has been thematic (*mawḍū'ī*), a form that has no direct classical counterpart and breaks significantly from the description of the literary genre since, in the main, it leaves the principle of following the order of the scriptural text. The *tafsīr* of Maḥmūd Shaltūt [*q.v.*], for example, does follow the Ḳur'ān *sūra*-by-*sūra*, but emphasises the themes which emerge from a given *sūra* and then brings that theme into conjunction with all other passages dealing with the same theme. The treatment of each *sūra* thus ends up being organised by theme rather than verse order (see K. Zebiri, *Mahmūd Shaltūt and Islamic modernism*, Oxford 1993). As a technique of interpretation, this does not move far from Ibn Taymiyya's emphasis on the first source of interpretation being the Ḳur'ān itself. Nor, upon close analysis, is it significantly different methodologically from the classical exegetes' well-established willingness to adduce other passages from elsewhere in the Ḳur'ān which would help in the elucidation of a problematic verse (al-Ṭabarī, for example, provides many such instances of referring the reader back to earlier discussions of a given point of dispute). It is thus the form in which the commentary appears that gives the contemporary works their distinctiveness. The popularity of this method has also led to the publication of vast numbers of monographs dealing explicitly with single themes within the Ḳur'ān (e.g. Maḥmūd Shaltūt, *Min hudā 'l-Ḳur'ān*, which contains a number of individual monographs).

It is important to observe as well that in contem-

porary times, the writing of *tafāsīr* in languages other than Arabic has become more significant. While classical examples of such books exist in languages from Persian to Malay, such works were frequently (although not always; cf. the Persian *tafsīr* of al-Maybudī, d. 6th/12th century [*q.v.*], *Kashf al-asrār wa-ʿuddat al-abrār*) based around translations from Arabic. In contemporary times there has been a recognition of the need to express an interpretation of the Ḳurʾān in local languages and to raise interpretational issues of local concern. The extent of the material, as reflected in the example of Indonesia (see H. Federspiel, *Popular Indonesian literature on the Qurʾan*, Ithaca 1994), indicates that this will be a significant field of study in the future. *Tafsīr* has also been an important vehicle for new religious expressions, notably in the case of the Bābī and Bahāʾī faiths, once again indicating an increasing flexibility in the genre within the contemporary period.

Bibliography: Largely given in the text. C. Gilliot, *Exégèse, langue et théologie en Islam*, contains a significant bibliography of the subject. For further bibliographies, see A. Rippin, *The present status of tafsīr studies*, in *MW*, lxxii [1982], 224-38; A. Neuwirth, *Koran*, in H. Gätje (ed.), *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie*, Band II, *Literaturwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden 1987, 119-35 (sections 3.7 and 3.8) and Band III, *Supplement* (W. Fischer, ed.), Wiesbaden 1992, 262-4. Still valuable as an overview of the subject is T. Nöldeke and F. Schwally, *Geschichte des Qorāns*, ii, *Die Sammlung des Qorāns*, Leipzig 1919, 163-92. Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Dhahabī, *al-Tafsīr wa ʾl-mufassirūn*, ²Cairo 1967, surveys the major *tafāsīr* in a useful manner. (A. RIPPIN)

TĀFTA (P.), a type and weave of fabric used mainly in dress in Persia and Turkey from the 16th century onwards. Since the verb *tāftan* has many meanings, e.g. to twist, turn, be woven, be shining, be sparkling, there has been much ambiguity and confusion of identification; the term has been used indiscriminately for both silk cloth and linen garments. The safest definition is based on technique, and here the meanings "twisted" and "shining" are important. *Tāfta* is a silk cloth of technically simple plain or tabby weave. Fine horizontal silk weft threads pass over and under single alternating vertical silk warp threads of equal weight and thickness to produce a firm textured, but supple and versatile, fabric. *Tāfta* was usually dyed in one colour only, and has a soft shimmering appearance, in contrast to the highly-polished surface of satin.

Tāfta was woven in large quantities in Persia during the Ṣafawid period as a light silk garment fabric. The best surviving examples are coats of 17th century date, with tight bodices, long sleeves and full bell-shaped skirts which were all probably woven in Iṣfahān, with Yazd and Kirmān as important secondary centres of manufacture. Background colours include light blue, orange and golden yellow. Variations in the basic *tāfta* weave depend on the twist of the silk, which produces a more or less pronounced ribbed effect. *Tāfta* can be decorated with stamped geometric motifs or with sprays of flowers woven in supplementary brocade weave in coloured silks and gold and silver wire. *Tāfta* production continued into the 18th and 19th centuries, brocaded with small repeated floral motifs. *Tāfta* was used in Turkey from the 16th century onwards, mainly as a plain fabric decorated with stamped designs. Here it was used as linings and facings in contrasting colours to the long, formal *kaftan* and *entari* robes made of velvet or heavy silk brocade. *Tāfta* passed into Europe as Italian *taffeta*, German *Taft*, where, although possibly represented in 16th century paintings, it is best known as a light silk fabric in fresh colours—blue, green, pink—made into women's fashionable dresses of the late 17th to 18th centuries. The *tāfta* weave survives today but it is machine-woven in synthetic fibres.

Bibliography: Nancy A. Reath and Eleanor B. Sachs, *Persian textiles and their techniques from the sixth to the eighteenth centuries, including a system for general textile classification*, New Haven 1937; Carol Bier (ed.), *Woven from the soul, spun from the heart*, Textile Museum, Washington D.C. 1987; Hülya Tezcan, *Atlaslar atlası. A catalogue of the Vedat Nedim Tor fabric collection*, Istanbul 1993.

(JENNIFER M. SCARCE)

AL-TAFTĀZĀNĪ, SAʿD AL-DĪN MASʿŪD B. ʿUMAR b. ʿAbd Allāh, renowned scholar and author on grammar, rhetoric, theology, logic, law and Ḳurʾān exegesis, born in Ṣafar 722/February-March 1322 in Taftāzān, a village near Nasā in Khurāsān, d. 793/1390 (on the form of this placename, see al-Samʿānī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥaydarābād, iii, 61-2; Yāḳūt, *Buldān*, ed. Beirut, ii, 35).

His family seems to have been distinguished in scholarship for several generations, and his grandfather Fakhr al-Dīn ʿUmar was a *ḳāḍī*. Nothing certain is known about his education. Ibn Ḥadjar al-ʿAsḳalānī in his unreliable biographical notice in his *Inbāʾ* describes him as a pupil of ʿAḍud al-Dīn al-Īdjī and Ḳuṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī without specifying a time or place for his alleged studies with them. It is, in fact, unlikely that al-Īdjī ever taught him. In his commentary on al-Īdjī's *Sharḥ al-Mukhtaṣar fi ʾl-uṣūl*, al-Taftāzānī praises him highly without referring to him as his teacher. A story reported by Ibn al-ʿImād about al-Taftāzānī's having at first been the most stupid among al-Īdjī's pupils is entirely fictitious. According to Ibn ʿArabshāh, al-Taftāzānī and Ḳuṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī were both among the scholars active at the court of the Khāns of the Golden Horde in Sarāy. If they were there at the same time, al-Taftāzānī may have benefited from Ḳuṭb al-Dīn's learning in philosophy. He was, however, already an established scholar at that time. More reliable is perhaps a note in Ibn Ḥadjar's biography of Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd Allāh al-Ḳazwīnī al-Ḳirimī that al-Taftāzānī was among his pupils. Al-Taftāzānī's fields of learning, especially his expertise in both Ḥanafī and Shāfiʿī law and *uṣūl*, closely matched those of Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn. Al-Taftāzānī, in any case, completed his earliest book, a commentary on *al-Taṣrīf al-ʿIzzī* by al-Zandjānī on Arabic morphology, in 738/1338 at the age of sixteen, according to Faṣīḥ al-Khʷāfī in Faryūmad.

His further peregrinations are better known from the dates and places of completion of his works. In 742/1342 he was in Djurdjāniyya in Khʷārazm. Then he became attached to the ruler of Harāt, Muʿizz al-Dīn Kart, to whom he dedicated his *Sharḥ al-Talkhīṣ al-muṭawwal* in 748/1347. In 752/1351 he was in Djām. Next, he joined Djānī Beg, Khān of the Golden Horde, to whom he dedicated his *Mukhtaṣar al-maʿānī*, completed at Ghudjduwān in 756/1355. Two years later he was in "Gülistān of Turkistān". Gülistān is known as a mint of the Golden Horde; its exact location is uncertain, but it has been thought to be near New Sarāy. Al-Taftāzānī departed, presumably because of the troubles following the death of Djānī Beg, and was back in Harāt in 759/1358. He completed books in Khʷārazm in 768/1367, 770/1369, and 778/1367-8 and was evidently attached during this period